

# FERENCE & ASSOCIATES LLC

409 Broad Street  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15143  
Phone: (412) 741-8400  
Fax: (412) 741-9292  
Web: www.ferencelaw.com

**RECEIVED**  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

**MAY 16 2007**

## USPTO FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

---

To: Examiner Yin Chen Shaw  
Fax Number: 571-273-8300  
Date: May 16, 2007  
Pages: 8 pages (including this cover sheet)

---

### MESSAGE:

Application No. 10/685,846

METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR  
PERVASIVE AUTHENTICATING DOMAINS

Agenda for telephone interview on May 22, 2007

YOR920030518US1  
(590.122)

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS COMMUNICATION IS CONFIDENTIAL, MAY BE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED, MAY CONSTITUTE INSIDE INFORMATION, AND IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE ADDRESSEE. UNAUTHORIZED USE, DISCLOSURE, OR COPYING IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED AND MAY BE UNLAWFUL.

IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR,  
PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US ON (412) 741-8400.

**INFORMAL COMMUNICATION****A METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PERVASIVE AUTHENTICATION DOMAINS**

Appln. Serial No. 10/685,846

(Atty. Docket No. 590.122)

**Interview Agenda**

Interview Date: Tuesday, May 22, 2007

Interview Time: 10:30 a.m.

Confirmed Participants: Stanley Ference – Attorney  
Yin Chen Shaw – Examiner  
Andrew Gabriel – Law Clerk

Posture of Case: First Office Action (non-final). This was the first office action issued by Examiner Shaw.

Status of Claims: Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 19, and 24-29 are independent; claims 2-6, 8-18, and 20-23 are dependent.

Claims 1-29 have been rejected. Claim 13 is objected for failing to provide an antecedent basis for “transferring the protected key.”

Claims 1, 5, 7, 19 and 25-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Engberg et al. (U.S. Patent 6,993,658).

Claims 2, 3, 6, 8-10, 12, 15-18 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engberg et al. (U.S. Patent 6,993,658) and further in view of Traversat et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0152299).

Claims 4, 11, and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engberg et al. (U.S. Patent 6,993,658) and further in view of Lincke et al. (U.S. Patent 6,253,326).

Claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engberg et al. (U.S. Patent 6,993,658) and Traversat et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0152299) and further in view of Lewis et al. (U.S. Patent 6,233,565).

Topic: Applicant would like to address the outstanding rejections and discuss possible amendments to the claims such that the claims as amended would be allowed. Proposed amendments are set forth on the attached sheet for discussion purposes.